U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

U.S. Department of Education
FY 2009 Annual Performance Report

U.S. Department of Education
Arne Duncan
Secretary

Office of the Chief Financial Officer
Thomas Skelly
Delegated to Perform the Functions and Duties
  of the Chief Financial Officer

February 1, 2010

This report is available on the Department's Web site at http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/performance.html .

On request, this publication is available in alternative formats, such as Braille, large print or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at 202-260-0852 or 202-260-0818.

The Department's *Strategic Plan* is available on the Web at http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/strat/index.html.

Department annual plans and annual reports are available on the Web at http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/index.html.

The Department welcomes all comments and suggestions on both the content and presentation of this report. Please forward them to PARcomments@ed.gov

Office of the Chief Financial Officer
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202–0600

Our mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.
WWW.ED.GOV

FOREWORD

As required by the *Government Performance and Results Act of 1993,* each federal agency must report annually on its progress in meeting the goals and objectives established by its *Strategic Plan.* The United States Department of Education's (the Department's) *Annual Performance Report* (APR) for fiscal year (FY) 2009 presents to Congress, the President and the American people detailed information about progress in meeting the Department's strategic goals and objectives and key performance measures. The APR is released in support of the Department's Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ). The complete CBJ can be accessed at http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/performance.html.

The APR is one in a series of three reports required under the Office of Management and Budget's Pilot Program for Alternative Approaches to Performance and Accountability Reporting. For the first time in FY 2009, the Department is participating in this voluntary program with the intent to strengthen annual reporting documents and to present more streamlined and timely information to clarify the relationship between performance, budgetary resources and financial reporting. The Department intends to provide a more meaningful, transparent and easily understood analysis.

The Department's FY 2009 Pilot annual reporting includes the following three components:

Annual Performance Report (APR)
[available February 2010]

The APR is produced in conjunction with the FY 2011 Congressional Budget Justification and provides detailed performance information and descriptions of results by each key performance measure.

Summary of Performance and Financial Information
[available February 2010]

This document provides an overview of performance and financial information that integrate significant aspects of the *Agency Financial Report* and the APR into a user-friendly, consolidated format.

Agency Financial Report (AFR) [published November 2009]

The AFR is organized into three major sections:

- The Management's Discussion and Analysis section provides executive-level information on the Department's history, mission, organization, key activities, analysis of financial statements, systems, controls and legal compliance, accomplishments for the fiscal year and management and performance challenges facing the Department.

- The Financial Details section provides a Message From the Chief Financial Officer, the Department's notes to the financial statements, consolidated and combined financial statements and the Report of the Independent Auditors.

- The Other Accompanying Information section provides *Improper Payments Information Act* reporting details and other statutory reporting requirements.

All three reports and complete Budget information are available on the Department's Web site at
http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/performance.html

CONTENTS

Overview

OVERVIEW

The United States Department of Education's *Annual Performance Report* (APR) for fiscal year (FY) 2009 provides detailed information on how the outcomes of the strategic performance measures identified in its *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* and updated in the *Fiscal Year 2008 Performance and Accountability Report* were met. It also details areas in need of improvement that the Department must address for those measures not meeting or exceeding targeted expectations.

This year, the Department is reporting on its *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan.* A new strategic plan for FY 2010–2015 is under development. The Department will assess all measures that appear in this report and decide which will be reported in support of the FY 2010–2015 plan, which will be revised and which will need to be discontinued and replaced. Retained, revised and discontinued measures will appear in the *FY 2010 Annual Performance Report* during the transition between plans.

In FY 2009, the Department voluntarily participated in the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) Pilot Program for Alternative Approaches to Performance and Accountability Reporting in an effort to present more streamlined information to the public, Congress and the President. The *Annual Performance Report* (APR) is required under the OMB Pilot Program. The initial report, the *Agency Financial Report,* released in November 2009, provided detailed information on the Department's financial performance and stewardship over its financial resources in accordance with the *Government Performance and Results Act of 1993* (*GPRA*). For a copy of the full report, go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/agency-financial-report.pdf.

The Secretary has outlined achievements, future initiatives and challenges for the Department in FY 2009 and certified that the Department's performance data are fundamentally complete and reliable in his letter published in the *Agency Financial Report.* For more information, go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/1-message.pdf.

This document is tied to the Congressional Budget Justification for FY 2011 and the budget process for the upcoming year. For more information, go to http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/performance.html.

Following is a brief overview of selected items contained in the *FY 2009 Agency Financial Report* with Web links specific to the sections discussed.

Linking Taxpayer Dollars to Performance Results

In this economy, the President has requested that federal agencies become more fiscally responsible. The Department strives to link taxpayer dollars to performance results, to ensure accountability for the expenditure of its grant and contract dollars and has undertaken significant measures to implement administrative cost savings within the agency. By including detailed performance information with the President's Budget, the Department will link its performance results to its budget requests. For more information, please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/2a-mda-linking.pdf.

Data Validity

The Department strives to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data it uses to support its budget requests. The Department has established procedures for the validation and verification of the data that it uses. To access the Department's guidance to individual program offices and the worksheet for ensuring data accuracy, please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/2b-mda-validate.pdf.

Accomplishments and Initiatives for FY 2009

During FY 2009, the Department was tasked with the enormous responsibility of allocating significant funding by the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (*Recovery Act*). The *Recovery Act* invests heavily in education with a total of $98.2 billion in appropriations to the Department to strengthen reform efforts in elementary, secondary and higher education. For more information on Department programs receiving supplemental *Recovery Act* funding, success stories about school districts and states receiving *Recovery Act* funding and information about the Department's accomplishments for FY 2009 and ongoing initiatives—including its efforts to improve delivery services for Federal Student Aid—please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/2c-mda-accomplishments.pdf.

Our Benefit to the Public

Each one of the four strategic goals identified in the Department's *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* was developed to address needs in the educational arena. For more information on how each goal is geared toward specific areas that address the needs of the public the Department serves and the resources and strategies that it uses to achieve its performance goals and objectives, please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/2e-mda-performance.pdf.

Management Challenges

The Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) identified three significant challenges for the Department for FY 2010. These challenges were implementing the *Recovery Act*, overseeing and monitoring the federal student financial assistance programs and managing information security. The Department is making significant progress toward meeting these challenges. To read more about the Department's management challenges and how it is working to meet them, please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/2g-mda-challenges.pdf.

Financial Highlights and Detailed Financial Information for FY 2009

For the eighth consecutive year, the Department achieved an unqualified audit opinion on its annual financial statements. Since 2003, the independent auditors have identified no material weaknesses in the Department's internal control over financial reporting. To read the full report of the independent auditors, please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/4-auditors.pdf.

For an overview and analysis of the Department's sources of funds and financial position, including the balance sheet and statement of net cost, please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/2f-mda-highlights.pdf.

To review the Department's financial summary and complete financial statements—including required supplementary stewardship information and notes to the principal financial statements for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2009, and September 30, 2008—please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/3-financial-details.pdf.

For information on the *Improper Payments Information Act* reporting details, which includes a risk assessment of certain programs, please go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/5a-improper-payments.pdf.

Performance Summary

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE RESULTS

In FY 2009, the measures provided in this report are measures that provide an overall assessment of the Department's progress in improving the educational system, based on the *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012.* A new strategic plan that reflects the current administration's framework for education reform will be reviewed and published during fiscal year (FY) 2010 and will be the basis for annual performance reporting for FY 2010. For more information on the Department's strategic planning process, as well as a goal-by-goal summary of strategic objectives and resources, see http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2009report/2e-mda-performance.pdf.

Each year, the Department assesses measures for that year's performance plan and evaluates the utility and appropriateness of those measures. As a result, the measures are continued, replaced or completely removed from the objective measurement process. This assessment process provides a method for continued improvement in Department programs.

Shown on the following pages are the results for each measure as of December 2009. The table shows whether the result met or exceeded, did not meet but improved over the prior years or failed to meet the expected target. The shaded areas indicate that a measure was not in place or that no data were available during this time period. In some cases, establishing a baseline is the target and the target is recognized as met if the data are available and the baseline has been established. For measures for which data are not currently available, the date the data are expected to be available has been indicated.

The table on the following pages summarizes the Department's performance results for FY 2009 measures. There are 81 performance measures that support the Department's mission and strategic goals. Most data for FY 2009 will be available during FY 2010.

In FY 2008, the year with the most available data, the Department met or exceeded targets for 31 measures (38.3 percent), did not meet but showed improvement for 26 (32.1 percent), did not meet 11 (13.6 percent), and is awaiting data for 7 measures (8.6 percent). The remaining 6 (7.4 percent) have no targets or data for FY 2008. Targets for FY 2008 are listed next to each measure that has a numerical target to provide a context for the results. FY 2009 targets are available in the Performance Details section of the report, but are not used here because a majority of the FY 2009 data is not available.

Performance Results for FY 2009 Measures

Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
Strategic Goal 1—Improve student achievement, with a focus on bringing all students to grade level in reading and mathematics by 2014			
1.1. Improve student achievement in reading			
A. Percentage of all students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 76.2% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
B. Percentage of low-income students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 66.5% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
C. Percentage of American Indian/Alaska Native students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 70.1% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met	Not met*
D. Percentage of African American students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 66.6% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met	Not met*
E. Percentage of Hispanic students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 64.0% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
F. Percentage of students with disabilities who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 54.0% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
G. Percentage of Limited English Proficient students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 54.9% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met
H. Percentage of career and technical education concentrators who are proficient in reading [Target: 61% for FY 2008]	May 2010	Met	NA
1.2. Improve student achievement in mathematics			
A. Percentage of all students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 73.8% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
B. Percentage of low-income students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 64.2% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
C. Percentage of American Indian/Alaska Native students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 64.9% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
D. Percentage of African American students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 61.6%for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
E. Percentage of Hispanic students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 63.9% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
F. Percentage of students with disabilities who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 53.3% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
G. Percentage of Limited English Proficient students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 57.5% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met*	Not met*

Key:
* Not met but improved over prior years
** Data not collected
NA = No measure for period

Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
H. Percentage of career and technical education concentrators who are proficient in mathematics [Target: 54% for FY 2008]	May 2010	Met	NA
1.3. Improve teacher quality			
A. Percentage of total core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
B. Percentage of total core elementary classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
C. Percentage of core elementary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
D. Percentage of core elementary classes in low-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
E. Percentage of total core secondary classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
F. Percentage of core secondary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
G. Percentage of core secondary classes in low-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100% for FY 2008]	Mar. 2010	Not met*	Not met*
1.4. Promote safe, disciplined and drug-free learning environments			
A. Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who carried a weapon (such as a knife, gun, or club) on school property one or more times during the past 30 days	Aug. 2010	NA	Not met*
B. Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who missed one or more days of school during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school, or on their way to and from school	Aug. 2010	NA	Not met*
C. Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who were offered, given, or sold an illegal drug by someone on school property in the past year	Aug. 2010	NA	Met
1.5. Increase information and options for parents			
A. Percentage of eligible students exercising choice [Target: 2.4% for FY 2008]	Jan. 2010	Not met*	Met
B. Percentage of eligible students participating in supplemental educational services [Target: 16.8% for FY 2008]	Jan. 2010	Not met	Not met*
C. Number of charter schools in operation [Target: 4,290 for FY 2008]	Feb. 2010	Met	Met
1.6. Increase high school completion rate			
A. Percentage of total 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 87.4% for FY 2008]	Jul. 2011	Jul. 2010	Met
B. Percentage of African American 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 88.5% for FY 2008]	Jul. 2011	Jul. 2010	Met

Key:
* Not met but improved over prior years
** Data not collected
NA = No measure for period

Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
C. Percentage of Hispanic 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 70.3% for FY 2008]	Jul. 2011	Jul. 2010	Met
D. Averaged freshman graduation rate [Target: 76.6% for FY 2008]	Jul. 2011	Jul. 2010	Not met*
1.7. Transform education into an evidence-based field			
A. Number of Department-supported reading or writing programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 11 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
B. Number of Department-supported mathematics or science programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 7 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
C. Number of Department-supported teacher quality programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 5 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
D. Number of visits to the What Works Clearinghouse Web site [Target: 530,000 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
Strategic Goal 2—Increase the academic achievement of all high school students			
2.1. Increase the proportion of high school students taking a rigorous curriculum			
A. Percentage of low-income students who qualify for Academic Competitiveness Grants [Target: 42% for FY 2008]	Sept. 2010	Not met	Met
B. Number of Advanced Placement classes available nationwide	**	**	**
C. Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by all public school students [Target: 2,168,000 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
D. Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students [Target: 328,932 for FY 2008]	Met	Not met*	Met
E. Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Black, Hispanic, Native American) public school students [Target: 421,000 for FY 2008]	Not met*	Met	Met
F. Number of teachers trained through Advanced Placement Incentive grants to teach Advanced Placement classes	**	**	**
2.2. Promote advanced proficiency in mathematics and science for all students			
A. Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by all public school students [Target: 681,000 for FY 2008]	Not met*	Met	Met
B. Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by low-income public school students [Target: 70,000 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
C. Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by minority (Black, Hispanic, Native American) public school students [Target: 86,000 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met

Key:
* Not met but improved over prior years
** Data not collected
NA = No measure for period

Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
D. Number of teachers trained through Advanced Placement Incentive grants to teach Advanced Placement classes in mathematics and science	**	**	**
2.3. Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages			
A. Combined total number of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests in critical foreign languages passed by public school students [Target: 4,091 for FY 2008]	Met	Not met*	Met
Strategic Goal 3—Ensure the accessibility, affordability and accountability of higher education and better prepare students and adults for employment and future learning			
3.1. Increase success in and completion of quality postsecondary education			
A. Percentage of high school graduates aged 16–24 enrolling immediately in college [Target: 68% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Not met*	Not met
B. Percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college [Target: 70% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2011	Dec. 2010	Met
C. Percentage of career and technical education students who have transitioned to postsecondary education or employment by December of the year of graduation [Target: 90% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2011	Dec. 2010	Not met
D. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Title IV institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 71% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Met	Not met
E. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 66% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Not met*	Not met
F. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 68% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Met	Not met
G. Percentage of students enrolled at all Title IV institutions completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment [Target: 57% for FY 2008]	Jan. 2011	Met	Met
H. Percentage of freshmen participating in Student Support Services who complete an associate's degree at original institution or transfer to a four-year institution within three years [Target: 27.5% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Met	Not met
I. Percentage of first-time full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students enrolled at 4-year Historically Black Colleges and Universities graduating within six years of enrollment [Target: 39% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Not met	Not met*
J. Percentage of students, enrolled at 4-year Hispanic-Serving Institutions graduating within six years of enrollment [Target: 37% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2010	Met	Met

Key:
* Not met but improved over prior years
** Data not collected
NA = No measure for period

Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
K. Percentage of postsecondary career and technical education students who have completed a postsecondary degree or certification [Target: 47% for FY 2008]	Dec. 2011	Dec. 2010	Not met
3.2. Deliver student financial aid to students and parents effectively and efficiently			
A. Direct administrative unit costs for origination and disbursement of student aid (total cost per transaction) [Target: $4.15 for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
B. Customer service level on the American Customer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web [Target: 83 points for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Not met
C. Pell Grant improper payments rate [Target: 3.48% for FY 2008]	Not met*	Not met*	Not met
D. Direct Loan recovery rate [Target: 19.75% for FY 2008]	Not met	Met	Met
E. Federal Family Education Loan recovery rate [Target: 19.50% for FY 2008]	Not met	Met	Met
3.3. Prepare adult learners and individuals with disabilities for higher education, employment and productive lives			
A. Percentage of state vocational rehabilitation agencies that meet the employment outcome standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program [Target: 76% for FY 2008]	Apr. 2010	Met	Met
B. Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent [Target: 53% for FY 2008]	Feb. 2010	Met	Met
C. Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program [Target: 39% for FY 2008]	Feb. 2010	Met	Met
D. Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter [Target: 41% for FY 2008]	Feb. 2010	Met	Met
Strategic Goal 4—Cross-Goal Strategy on Management			
4.1. Maintain and strengthen financial integrity and management and internal controls			
A. Maintain an unqualified (clean) audit opinion [Target: Unqualified for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met
B. Achieve and maintain compliance with the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* [Target: Compliant for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
C. Percentage of new discretionary grants awarded by June 30 [Target: 70% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
4.2. Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital			
A. Percentage of employees believing that leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment [Target: 34% for FY 2008]	Not met*	Not met	Met

Key:
* Not met but improved over prior years
** Data not collected
NA = No measure for period

Performance Results Summary	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
B. Percentage of employees believing that managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives [Target: 59% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
C. Percentage of employees believing that steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve [Target: 31% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
D. Percentage of employees believing that department policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace [Target: 52% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met*	Not met*
E. Percentage of employees believing that they are held accountable for achieving results [Target: 83% for FY 2008]	Not met	Met	Met
F. Percentage of employees believing that the workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals [Target: 71% for FY 2008]	Not met	Not met	Met
G. Average number of days to hire is at or below the OPM 45-day hiring model for non-SES	Met	Met	Met
H. Percentage of employees with performance standards in place within 30 days of start of current rating cycle [Target: 90% for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Not met
I. Percentage of employees who have ratings of record in the system within 30 days of close of rating cycle [Target: 95% for FY 2008]	Not met	Met	Met
4.3. Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results			
A. Percentage of Department program dollars in programs that demonstrate effectiveness in terms of outcomes, either on performance indicators or through rigorous evaluations [Target: 88% for FY 2008]	Met	Met	Met

Key:
* Not met but improved over prior years
** Data not collected
NA = No measure for period

Performance

Details

PERFORMANCE DETAILS OVERVIEW

The Department presents measures and results for each of four strategic goals as defined by the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* and refined in the *FY 2008 Performance and Accountability Report*. For each strategic goal, the Department has selected program measures centered on the desired outcomes. The chapter for each goal provides specific details about the performance progress for each measure. Department data indicate no significant non-achievement at the goal or objective levels and 11 of 81 measures that did not meet targets with no demonstrated improvement in real terms. All other measures for which data are available have shown improvement in real terms or deviation from target levels is slight.

How to Read This Report

Each goal includes a table that describes the measures, indicates the actual performance and summarizes the results.

Table. Provides trend data including the latest reported data. Years for Targets and Actual data are listed at the top of each table. When Baseline data vary as to year, the top of the table identifies those columns with the word (Years). Some targets have been adjusted since publication of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* after review and approval by program, budget and performance representatives.

Source. Provides bibliographic information.

Analysis of Progress. Provides insights into the Department's progress, including explanations for unmet targets and actions being taken or planned.

Data Quality and Timeliness. Incorporates information such as the universe included in the measure; definitions; the way data were collected, calculated and reviewed; data strengths and limitations; and plans for improved data quality.

Target Context. Explains the rationale for targets, especially where anomalies exist.

Not all measures will include all data fields described above.

Methodology for Program Performance Summary

In keeping with the *Government Performance and Results Act of 1993,* the Department has established program-specific annual plans with measures and targets for the majority of the grant and loan programs and has provided the corresponding program performance reports in conjunction with the publication of the *FY 2009 Annual Performance Report.* Each program that has measures supports at least one of the Department's strategic goals. Web-based tables provide a summary of each program's performance results.

Since 2002, performance plans and reports have been published on the Department's Web site at http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/index.html?src=pn.

GOAL 1: Improve Student Achievement, With a Focus on Bringing All Students to Grade Level in Reading and Mathematics by 2014

Measures for Objective 1.1: Percentage of students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.1.A. All Students	*	68.3	72.3	70.2	76.2	70.5	80.2	Sept. 2010	84.2	88.1
1.1.B. Low-Income Students	*	55.3	60.9	57.4	66.5	58.1	72.1	Sept. 2010	77.7	83.2
1.1.F. Students With Disabilities	*	38.7	51.8	41.5	54.0	42.2	61.7	Sept. 2010	69.4	77.0
1.1.G. Limited English Proficient Students	*	39.8	47.3	38.8	54.9	39.8	62.4	Sept. 2010	69.9	77.4
1.1.H. Career and Technical Education Concentrators***					61	68	64	May 2010	68	68
Students From Major Racial and Ethnic Groups:**										
1.1.C. American Indian/Alaska Native	*	60.1	65.1	62.4	70.1	62.2	75.1	Sept. 2010	80.1	85.0
1.1.D. African American	*	55.5	61.1	58.4	66.6	57.7	72.2	Sept. 2010	77.8	83.3
1.1.E. Hispanic	*	52.0	58.0	54.3	64.0	56.3	70.0	Sept. 2010	76.0	82.0

* New measure in 2007. 2006 actual data are reported as baseline for 2007 and 2008 targets.
** African American, American Indian/Alaska Native and Hispanic students when they are of a statistically significant number to be reported by the states.
*** This measure was a newly established performance measure under the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV). Formerly there was one measure for academic achievement under Perkins III that included a measure that combined student results on reading and mathematics assessments.
Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For most measures in Objective 1.1, the targets were not met but results improved for FY 2008. Measures 1.1.C and 1.1.D declined slightly. There was no effect on program performance. Targets adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting since the FY *2007-2012 Strategic Plan.*

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies (SEAs) to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to integrate state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery. Data for school year 2009–2010 are expected in September 2010.

Target Context: In accordance with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended, the goal is for 100 percent of all students to achieve proficiency on state reading assessments by 2014. Starting in 2007 and ending in 2014, there are eight years to close the gap between the 2006 baseline and the 2014 ultimate goal of 100 percent. Therefore, targets for 2007 and 2008 were calculated by (1) subtracting the baseline percentage from 100 percent to determine the gap that must be closed, (2) dividing that gap by 8 to determine the annual improvement that would be needed if the gap were to be closed in a linear fashion, (3) adding that annual increment to the 2006 baseline to arrive at the 2007 target and (4) increasing the 2007 target by another annual incremental improvement to arrive at the 2008 target. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 as updates to the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Measures for Objective 1.2: Percentage of students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.2.A. All Students	*	65.0	69.4	68.0	73.8	69.6	78.1	Sept. 2010	82.5	86.9
1.2.B. Low-Income Students	*	52.3	58.3	55.9	64.2	57.8	70.2	Sept. 2010	76.2	82.1
1.2.F. Students With Disabilities	*	37.8	52.2	41.9	53.3	42.5	61.1	Sept. 2010	68.9	76.7
1.2.G. Limited English Proficient Students	*	43.3	50.4	44.7	57.5	46.7	64.6	Sept. 2010	71.7	78.7
1.2.H. Career and Technical Education Concentrators***					54	62	57	May 2010	62	63
Students From Major Racial and Ethnic Groups**:										
1.2.C. American Indian/Alaska Native	*	53.2	59.1	56.8	64.9	58.6	70.8	Sept. 2010	76.6	82.5
1.2.D. African American	*	48.8	55.2	52.9	61.6	54.1	68.0	Sept. 2010	74.4	80.8
1.2.E. Hispanic	*	51.8	57.8	54.8	63.9	57.7	69.9	Sept. 2010	75.9	81.9

* New measure in 2007. 2006 actual data are reported as baseline for 2007 and 2008 targets.
** African American, American Indian/Alaska Native and Hispanic students when they are of a statistically significant number to be reported by the states.
*** This measure was a newly established performance measure under the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV). Formerly there was one measure for academic achievement under Perkins III that included a measure that combined student results on reading and mathematics assessments.
Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For the measures in Objective 1.2, the targets were not met but results improved over prior years for FY 2008. There was no effect on overall program or activity performance. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007-2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to encourage the integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery. Measures were not in place for 2006; data for school year 2009–2010 are expected in September 2010.

Target Context: In accordance with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (*ESEA*), as amended, the goal is for 100 percent of all students to achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments by 2014. The baselines are the actual results in 2006. Starting in 2007 and ending in 2014, there are eight years to close the gap between the 2006 baseline and the 2014 ultimate goal of 100 percent. Therefore, targets for 2007 and 2008 were calculated by: (1) subtracting the baseline percentage from 100 percent to determine the gap that must be closed, (2) dividing that gap by 8 to determine the annual improvement that would be needed if the gap were to be closed in a straight-line fashion, (3) adding that annual increment to the 2006 baseline to arrive at the 2007 target and (4) increasing the 2007 target by another annual incremental improvement to arrive at the 2008 target.

Measures for Objective 1.3: Percentage of class type taught by highly qualified teachers

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.3.A. Total Core Academic Classes	*	91	100	94	100	95	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.B. Total Core Elementary Classes**	95	94	100	95.9	100	96.5	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.C. Core Elementary Classes in High-Poverty Schools	*	90.4	100	93.5	100	94.9	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.D. Core Elementary Classes in Low-Poverty Schools	*	95.8	100	96.6	100	97.5	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.E. Total Core Secondary Classes**	92	90.9	100	93	100	93.9	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.F. Core Secondary Classes in High-Poverty Schools	*	85.7	100	88.7	100	89.6	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.G. Core Secondary Classes in Low-Poverty Schools	*	93.8	100	95.4	100	96	100	Mar 2010	100	100

* New measure in 2007.
** FY 2006 targets based on earlier measures.
Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For the measures in Objective 1.3, targets were not met but results improved over prior years. There was no effect on overall program or activity performance. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007-2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to encourage the integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The targets are based on legislative initiatives, including the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended.

Measures for Objective 1.4: Promoting safe, disciplined and drug-free learning environments

Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who:	Results*								Plan	
	FY 2003		FY 2005		FY 2007		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.4.A. Carried a Weapon (Such as a Knife, Gun, or Club) on School Property One or More Times During the Past 30 Days	N/A	6.1	5.0	6.5	5.0	5.9	4.0	August 2010	N/A*	4.0
1.4.B. Missed One or More Days of School During the Past 30 Days Because They Felt Unsafe at School, or on Their Way to and from School	N/A	5.4	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	August 2010	N/A*	4.0
1.4.C. Were Offered, Given, or Sold an Illegal Drug by Someone on School Property in the Past Year	N/A	28.7	28.0	25.4	27.0	22.3	26.0	August 2010	N/A*	25.0

N/A = Not Available.
*Data gathered only in odd-numbered years.
Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Analysis of Progress: For FY 2007, targets were not met but results generally improved over prior years for measures 1.4.A. and 1.4.B. The results for measure 1.4.C. exceeded the target. Desired results are declines in reported activities.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, a data collection supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The survey monitors six categories of priority health risk behaviors among youth, including violence and alcohol and other drug use. Data reported for these measures come from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System National Survey; data for this survey are collected in odd years and reported in the following even year. Details about the methods used to select the sample and other issues are available at http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/index.htm. Data from the FY 2009 survey will be available in summer 2010.

Target Context: Lower percentages indicate improvement on these measures. Data are based on a biennial survey and gathered only in odd-numbered years.

Measures for Objective 1.5: Increasing information and options for parents

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		**FY 2007**		**FY 2008**		**FY 2009**		**FY 2010**	**FY 2011**
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.5.A. Percentage of Eligible Students Exercising Choice	N/A	1.2	N/A	2.2	2.4	2.3	N/A	Jan. 2010	3.6	N/A
1.5.B. Percentage of Eligible Students Participating in Supplemental Educational Services	N/A	14	15.4	14.5	16.8	13.8	18.2	Jan. 2010	19.6	20.3
1.5.C. Number of Charter Schools in Operation	3,600	3,997	3,900	4,155	4,290	4,376	4,720	Feb. 2010	5,190	5,710

BL = Baseline, N/A = Not Available.
Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Measure 1.5.A.: Percentage of Eligible Students Exercising Choice

Analysis of Progress: Target not fully met in FY 2008 but improved over prior years. No target set for FY 2009. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The 2006 actual serves as the baseline. Targets for this measure were developed for every two years from the baseline year (2006). Accordingly, there is no target for 2007, 2009, or 2011. The target for 2008 is the baseline times two (2006 actual x 2). The target for 2010 is the baseline times 3 (2006 actual x 3).

Measure 1.5.B.: Percentage of Eligible Students Participating in Supplemental Educational Services

Analysis of Progress: Target not met in FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The 2006 actual serves as the baseline. The target for 2007 is the baseline times 1.1 (1.1 x 2006 actual). The target for 2008 is the baseline times 1.2 (1.2 x 2006 actual). The target for 2009 is the baseline times 1.3 (2006 actual x 1.3). The target for 2010 is the baseline times 1.4 (2006 actual x 1.4). The target for 2011 is the baseline times 1.45 (2006 actual x 1.45).

Measure 1.5.C.: Number of Charter Schools in Operation

Analysis of Progress: Target exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: FY 2007 and FY 2008. Source: U.S. Department of Education, Education Data Exchange Network (ED*Facts*). Prior years' data were reported by the Center for Education Reform. The performance goal for the Charter Schools program is to increase the number of charter schools in operation by 10 percent each year beginning in 2005.

Measures for Objective 1.6: Percentage of 18–24-Year-Olds Who Have Completed High School[1]

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.6.A. Total	87.6	87.8	87.3	89.0	87.4	July 2010	87.6	July 2011	87.8	88.0
1.6.B. African American	83.4	84.8	85.3	88.8	85.5	July 2010	85.8	July 2011	86.0	86.3
1.6.C. Hispanic	70.2	70.8*	70.1	72.7	70.3	July 2010	70.6	July 2011	71.0	71.5
1.6.D. Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate[2]	74.3	73.2*	75.2	73.9	76.6	July 2010	77.9	July 2011	79.3	80.8

Sources:
*Adjusted totals
[1] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey. Data are collected annually.
[2] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, State Non-fiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education. Data are collected annually. Averaged freshman graduation rate is a Common Core of Data measure that provides an estimate of the percentage of high school students who graduate on time by dividing the number of graduates with regular diplomas by the size of the incoming class four years earlier.

Measures 1.6.A., 1.6.B. and 1.6.C.: Total, African American and Hispanic

Analysis of Progress: Most targets were exceeded in FY 2006 and FY 2007. Data for FY 2008 and FY 2009 are not yet available and thus unable to be assessed. Targets have been adjusted to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan.*

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for column "FY 2006" in the table were based on data for the 2005–2006 school year, released in September 2008. Data for the 2006–2007 school year (column "FY 2007" in the table) were released in September 2009. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column "FY 2008") are not expected for release until July 2010. Data for the 2008–2009 school year (column "FY 2009") are not expected for release until July 2011.

Measure 1.6.D.: Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate

Analysis of Progress: Data for FY 2008 and FY 2009 are not yet available and are unable to be assessed. Targets were not met for FY 2006 or FY 2007, but improvement is shown.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012,* published in May 2007, included measures developed in 2006. The 2005–2006 (column "FY 2006" in this table) data were released in July 2008. Data for the 2006–2007 school year (column "FY 2007") were released in September 2009. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column "FY 2008") are not expected for release until July 2010. Data for the 2008–2009 school year (column "FY 2009") are not expected for release until July 2011.

Target Context: As of July 2009, 20 states reported adjusted cohort graduation rates. The rates track students from when they enter high school to when they leave. Other states used measures based on annually reported aggregate data that did not follow the progress of individual students over time. Twenty-eight states estimated graduation rates by dividing the number of graduates in a given year by the number of graduates plus estimates of dropouts over the preceding 4 years. This rate has been referred to as the leaver rate. The remaining states used other measures to fulfill this reporting requirement. Because of the lack of comparability in the different approaches taken to reporting on-time graduation rates and because of limitations in the leaver rate for measuring on-time graduation, the Department publishes a rate designed to estimate on-time graduation for all states using a common data source: the Common Core of Data, produced by the National Center for Education Statistics. That rate, technically referred to as the averaged freshman graduation rate, uses aggregate data to estimate the number of first-time 9th graders in the fall 4 years prior to the graduation year being reported and divides that into the number of diplomas awarded in the reporting year.

Measures for Objective 1.7: Transforming education into an evidence-based field

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Number of Department-Supported Programs and Practices with Evidence of Efficacy Using WWC Standards:										
1.7.A. Reading or Writing	3	3	6	6	11	11	13	13	15	17
1.7.B. Mathematics or Science	1	1	3	4	7	8	10	11	12	15
1.7.C. Teacher Quality	1	1	3	3	5	5	7	7	10	12
1.7.D. Number of Visits to the WWC** Website			*	482,000	530,000	531,162	583,000	772,154	641,000	705,000

* New measure in 2007. The 2007 actual serves as the baseline.
**WWC = What Works Clearinghouse.

Measures 1.7.A., 1.7.B. and 1.7.C.: Reading or Writing, Mathematics or Science and Teacher Quality

Analysis of Progress: In fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009, targets for reading, writing and teacher quality were met and targets for mathematics or science were exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data were self-reported by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES).

Target Context: The Department's measures for evaluating progress toward the goal of transforming education into an evidence-based field are tied to the clearinghouse. The measures assess the productivity of IES's investments in producing scientifically valid research on teaching and instruction with respect to the core academic competencies of reading/writing and mathematics/science. The measure that is tracked is the number of programs and practices on these topics that have been developed with IES funding and that have been shown to be effective in raising student achievement under the research quality standards of the clearinghouse. As shown by clearinghouse reviews of existing research on program effectiveness in reading/writing and mathematics, few older studies meet the clearinghouse quality standards. Thus the targets under this measure are ambitious and will, if met, result in a doubling—or more—of the existing base of research-proven programs and practices. Targets are based on the number of grants awarded in the subject areas and the maturation of the grants and the numbers are cumulative.

Measure 1.7.D.: Number of Visits to the WWC Web site

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2007 target of setting a baseline was met. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets were exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data were self-reported by IES.

Target Context: This is a measure of utilization. It addresses the degree to which work that the clearinghouse has identified as effective is being accessed. The clearinghouse Web site is already heavily visited. The targets were set in 2007 using FY 2006 actual data as a baseline.

GOAL 2: Increase the Academic Achievement of All High School Students

Measures for Objective 2.1: Increase the proportion of high school students taking a rigorous curriculum

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
2.1.A. Percentage of Low-Income Students Who Qualify for Academic Competitiveness Grants** [1]	N/A		*	35	42	26	49	Sept. 2010	56	63
2.1.B. Number of Advanced Placement Classes Available Nationwide[2]	N/A		*	Not Collected	PY +10%	Not Collected	PY +10%	Not Collected	PY +10%	PY +10%
Number of Advanced Placement Tests Taken by Public School Students*** [3]										
2.1.C. Total	N/A	1,943,565	1,953,000	2,133,594	2,168,000	2,321,311	2,406,000	2,495,252	2,671,000	2,965,000
2.1.D. Low-Income	209,411	267,286	230,352	286,028	328,932	308,072	378,272	387,986	435,013	500,265
2.1.E. Minorities (Black, Hispanic, Native American)[†]	336,000	359,372	376,000	413,847	421,000	471,898	544,716	538,249	626,423	575,520
2.1.F. Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes[4]	N/A		*	Not Collected	PY +5%	Not Collected	PY +10%	Not Collected	PY +10%	PY +10%

N/A = Not Available, PY = Prior Year.
* New measure in 2007. The 2007 actual served as the baseline.
** Academic Competitiveness Grants sunset after 2011.
*** New measure in 2005. The 2005 actual served as the baseline.
[†] Advanced Placement measures use the definitional term Black.

Sources:
[1] National Center for Education Statistics, 2007-08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:08).
[2] The College Board, Ledger of Authorized Advanced Placement Courses. Data are reported annually.
[3] The College Board, Freeze File Report. Data are reported annually.
[4] U.S. Department of Education, Advanced Placement Incentive Program, Annual Performance Reports.

Measure 2.1.A.: Percentage of Low-Income Students Who Qualify for Academic Competitiveness Grants

Analysis of Progress: The American Competitiveness Initiative is a comprehensive strategy to keep this nation the most innovative in the world. Its goal is to strengthen high schools and prepare students for college or the workforce. The Department is committed to expanding Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs to increase teacher training in mathematics, science and critical foreign languages; to increase the number of students taking AP and IB mathematics, science and critical foreign language exams; and to triple the number of students passing AP and IB tests. Academic Competitiveness Grants (ACGs) provide financial incentives for students to take a rigorous course of study in high school and college. To qualify for ACGs, students must complete rigorous course-work, maintain good grades, be full-time students and be eligible for Federal Pell Grants.

The measure for 2008 considered first- and second-year undergraduate students less than 21 years of age at two- and four-year postsecondary institutions and compared ACG recipients to the total number of Pell Grant-qualified students (those who got Pell Grants plus ACG recipients). The program is scheduled to close in FY 2011.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for FY 2009 are expected in September 2010 through the National Student Loan Data System via Common Origination and Disbursement system data.

Target Context: FY 2007 was the first year of the Academic Competitiveness Grants program. Targets for future years were developed as follows: the numerator was determined through a review of Financial Student Aid records and the denominator was developed from high school graduation records for the 2004–05 and 2005–06 school years, with the estimates narrowed for low-income students by use of the 2003–04 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) and state estimates of the proportion of students taking rigorous curricula. The target is a challenging goal for the program—a 20 percent increase annually in the proportion of qualified students given ACG grants, potentially leading to doubling the proportion of students by FY 2011.

Measure 2.1.B.: Number of Advanced Placement Classes Available Nationwide

Analysis of Progress: Data for this measure were not collected for FY 2007, FY 2008 or FY 2009. The measure indicates number of Advanced Placement classes available nationwide for which no calculation is possible, in that individual classes are not identified for each school participating in the AP program.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Ledger of Authorized Advanced Placement Courses was initiated in 2007 and tracks only the number of courses offered, not the number of classes.

Measures 2.1.C., 2.1.D. and 2.1.E.: Number of Advanced Placement Tests Taken by Public School Students (Total, Low-Income and Minorities)

Analysis of Progress: Targets were originally established by the Department's program office and in the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*. Data are supplied by the College Board. The Department exceeded its targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009 for the total number of AP tests taken by public school students. It did not meet its target for low-income students for FY 2008 but did exceed it for FY 2009. For minority students, the Department exceeded its target for FY 2008 but did not meet the target for FY 2009. The Department continues to see growth in the overall numbers of AP courses and tests taken by public school students, especially low-income and minority students. Low-income is defined as those students who meet the requirements for free or reduced-price lunches.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported annually. Data are analyzed by the College Board and by the Department.

Target Context: These measures were not in place as strategic measures prior to 2005; 2005 actual data were used to set baselines and establish future targets.

Measure 2.1.F.: Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes

Analysis of Progress: No data have been collected for this measure.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Originally, these data were not collected because of a delay in proposed rulemaking. Funds were not appropriated for the Advanced Placement Incentive program as authorized by the *America COMPETES Act.*

Measures for Objective 2.2: Promote advanced proficiency in mathematics and science for all students

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Number of Advanced Placement Tests in Mathematics and Science Taken Nationwide by Public School Students:[1]										
2.2.A. Total	*	589,701	631,000	644,550	681,000	692,210	736,000	734,425	802,000	882,000
2.2.B. Low-Income	*	60,692	65,000	66,337	70,000	73,710	76,000	91,927	84,000	93,000
2.2.C. Minorities (Black, Hispanic, Native American)***	*	74,762	80,000	86,061	86,000	98,718	94,171	111,532	104,000	115,000
2.2.D. Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes in Mathematics and Science[2]	N/A		Estab. BL	Not Collected	PY +5%	Not Collected	PY +10%	Not Collected	PY +10%	PY +10%

BL = Baseline, N/A = Not Available, PY = Prior Year.
***Advanced Placement measures use the definitional term Black.
Sources:
[1]The College Board, Freeze File Report. Data are reported annually.
[2]U.S. Department of Education, Advanced Placement Incentive Program, Annual Performance Reports.

Measures 2.2.A., 2.2.B. and 2.2.C.: Number of Advanced Placement Tests in Mathematics and Science Taken Nationwide by Public School Students (Total, Low-Income and Minorities)

Analysis of Progress: Targets are established by the program office and by the Department's *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*. Data are supplied by the College Board. The Department exceeded its 2008 target for the total number of AP tests in mathematics and science taken by public school students, but did not meet its FY 2009 target. For low-income students, the Department exceeded its targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009. For minority students, it exceeded its FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets. The number of AP tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide continues to increase, especially for low-income students and minority students. Low-income students are defined as those students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunches.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported annually.

Target Context: FY 2006 served as the baseline. The Department established future targets based on the 2006 actual data.

Measure 2.2.D.: Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes in Mathematics and Science

Analysis of Progress: Data on this measure were not collected.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Originally, these data were not collected because of a delay in proposed rulemaking. Data for this measure were not collected because there were no funds appropriated for the Advanced Placement Incentive program authorized under the *America COMPETES Act.*

Measures for Objective 2.3: Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
2.3.A. Combined Total of Advanced Placement[1] and International Baccalaureate[2] Tests in Critical Foreign Languages Passed by Public School Students	N/A		Estab. BL	3,557	4,091	4,033	4,638	4,642	5,338	PY +15%

BL = Baseline, N/A = Not Available, PY = Prior Year.
Sources:
[1]The College Board, Freeze File Report. Data are reported annually.
[2]International Baccalaureate North America, Examination Review and Data Summary. Data are reported annually.

Measures 2.3.A.: Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages

Analysis of Progress: In 2007, 2008 and 2009, the College Board tested in AP for critical languages for Chinese and Japanese. In 2007 and 2008, International Baccalaureate of North America tested the critical languages of Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Russian and Turkish, but did not test for Turkish in 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported annually by the International Baccalaureate of North America and by the College Board.

Target Context: The Department used the FY 2007 actual to set the baseline. It did not meet its target for FY 2008 and exceeded the target only moderately for FY 2009. Targets are set at an increase of 15 percent over the actual values for the prior year. Targets and actuals are based on a total of all tests passed, regardless of score received.

GOAL 3: Ensure the Accessibility, Affordability and Accountability of Higher Education and Better Prepare Students and Adults for Employment and Future Learning

Measures for Objective 3.1: Increase success in and completion of quality postsecondary education

	(Years)*		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Postsecondary Enrollment										
3.1.A. Percentage of High School Graduates Aged 16–24 Enrolling Immediately in College[1]	(2006)	68.6	68	66	68	67.2	68	Dec. 2010	69	69
3.1.B. Percentage of Upward Bound Participants Enrolling in College[2]	(2006)	79.0	65	77.4	70	Dec. 2010	75	Dec. 2011	75	76
3.1.C. Percentage of Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation[3]	(2005)	87	89	86	90	Dec. 2010	**	**	**	**
Postsecondary Persistence										
3.1.D. Percentage of Full-Time Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students at Title IV Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution[4]	(2006)	70	71	70	71	71.1	71	Dec. 2010	72	72
3.1.E. Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution[4]	(2005)	65	66	62	66	65	66	Dec. 2010	67	67
3.1.F. Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution[4]	(2004)	64	68	63.5	68	69	68	Dec. 2010	69	69
Postsecondary Completion										
3.1.G. Percentage of Students Enrolled at All Title IV Institutions Completing a Four-Year Degree Within Six Years of Enrollment[5]	(2005)	57.1	57	57.3	57	58	57	Jan. 2011	58	58
3.1.H. Percentage of Freshmen Participating in Student Support Services Who Complete an Associate's Degree at Original Institution or Transfer to a Four-Year Institution Within Three Years[2]	(2006)	24.6	27.5	25.1	27.5	27.8	28.0	Dec. 2010	28.0	28.5
3.1.I. Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment[5]	(2005)	38	39	35	39	35	40	Dec. 2010	40	40
3.1.J. Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Hispanic-Serving Institutions Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment[5]	(2006)	35	37	44	37	42	44	Dec. 2010	45	45
3.1.K. Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or Certification[3]	(2005)	42	46	40	47	Dec. 2010	**	**	**	**

Note: The column pair labeled Results spans (Years)* through FY 2009; Plan spans FY 2010 and FY 2011.

*Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.

**Amended measure and new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance
Sources:
[1] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey.
[2] U.S. Department of Education, TRIO Annual Performance Report.
[3] Career and Technical Education Annual Performance Report and Grantee Performance Reports.
[4] U.S. Department of Education, NCES. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Enrollment Survey. Persistence measures the percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Title IV institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution.
[5] U.S. Department of Education, NCES. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Graduation Rate Survey.

Measure 3.1.A.: Percentage of High School Graduates Aged 16–24 Enrolling Immediately in College

Analysis of Progress: The enrollment rate increased slightly from 2007 to 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012,* published in May 2007, included measures developed in FY 2006. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column "2008" in the table) are expected for release in December 2010.

Target Context: The Department did not meet its 2008 target of 68 percent, although enrollment increased from 66.0 percent in FY 2007 to 67.2 percent in FY 2008.

Measure 3.1.B.: Percentage of Upward Bound Participants Enrolling in College

Analysis of Progress: Based on actual data significantly increasing over recent years, targets beyond 2008 have been increased.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Target Context: Based on consecutive years of performance exceeding targets, the targets were increased to 70 percent for 2008 and 75 percent for 2009. The target for FY 2008 was increased to 70 percent as part of the fall 2006 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) update and to 75 percent for 2009 in the spring 2007 PART update.

Measure 3.1.C.: Percentage of Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation

Analysis of Progress: Data for FY 2009 and FY 2008 will reflect changes in legislative requirements.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Actual data are entered through FY 2007. Data for FY 2008 are expected in March 2010 and a new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance. States submit their reports to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of submissions by entering an Electronic Personal Identification Number that is supplied to them by the Department. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff then completes a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follows up with states as necessary.

Target Context: The Department met its 2005 target of setting the baseline. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets are based on state-adjusted performance levels that were negotiated with and approved by the Department.

Measure 3.1.D.: Percentage of Full-Time Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students at Title IV Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution

Analysis of Progress: The rates declined slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Beginning in FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Target Context: The Department met its 2006 target of setting the baseline. It did not meet the 2007 national target of 71 percent. It met its 2008 target of 71 percent. Data for FY 2009 are expected in December 2010.

Measure 3.1.E.: Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution

Analysis of Progress: The rates declined slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Target Context: Through FY 2007, institutions had reported a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) program was calculated as a median. The target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2003–04, which was 3.6 percent. The reason for decline in persistence is unknown. The Department is beginning to analyze grantee performance for this program, which may provide some insight into factors behind this decline.

Measure 3.1.F.: Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution

Analysis of Progress: The rates increased slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Target Context: The long-term target for FY 2009 is 68 percent.

Measure 3.1.G.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at All Title IV Institutions Completing a Four-Year Degree Within Six Years of Enrollment

Analysis of Progress: The Department exceeded its FY 2007 target of 57 percent. The percentage of bachelor's degree-seeking students completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment improved, increasing to 57.5 percent (58%) in FY 2008 from 57.3 percent in FY 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Measure 3.1.H.: Percentage of Freshmen Participating in Student Support Services Who Complete an Associate's Degree at Original Institution or Transfer to a Four-Year Institution Within Three Years

Analysis of Progress: The Department met its FY 2007 target of 27.5 percent. The percentage of Student Support Service participants completing an associate's degree at original institution or transferring to a four-year institution increased substantially from 2006 to 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The annual performance report collects self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Measure 3.1.I.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment

Analysis of Progress: The percentage of students enrolled at four-year Historically Black Colleges and Universities graduating within six years of enrollment remained at 35 percent in 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Measure 3.1.J.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Hispanic-Serving Institutions Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment

Analysis of Progress: The Department significantly exceeded its FY 2008 target of 37 percent. The percentage of students enrolled at four-year Hispanic-Serving Institutions graduating within six years of enrollment increased from 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Measure 3.1.K.: Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or Certification

Analysis of Progress: Data for FY 2009 and FY 2008 will reflect changes in legislative requirements.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Actual data are entered through FY 2007. Data for 2008 are expected in March 2010 and a new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance. States submit their reports to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of submission by entering an Electronic Personal Identification Number that is supplied to them by the Department. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff then completes a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follows up with states as necessary.

Target Context: The Department met its 2005 target of setting the baseline. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets are based on state-adjusted performance levels that were negotiated with and approved by the Department.

Measures for Objective 3.2: Deliver student financial aid to students and parents effectively and efficiently

| | Results * | | | | | | | | Plan | |
| | (Years**) | | FY 2007 | | FY 2008 | | FY 2009 | | FY 2010 | FY 2011 |
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
3.2.A. Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid[1] *(Total Cost per Transaction)*	(2006)	$4.24	$4.25	$4.03	$4.15	$3.65	$4.00	$3.60	$4.00	$4.00
3.2.B. Customer Service Level on the American Consumer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web[2]	(2005)	81	82	80	83	83	84	84	85	85
3.2.C. Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate	(2006)	3.48%	3.48%	4.11%	3.48%	3.69%	3.41%	3.50%	3.35%	3.28%
3.2.D. Direct Loan Recovery Rate[3]	(2006)	19.00%	19.50%	20.8%	19.75%	21%	20.00%	18.0%	20.25%	20.50%
3.2.E. FFEL Recovery Rate	(2006)	19.3%	19.50%	19.60%	19.50%	23.6%	19.75%	19.70%	20.00%	20.25%

* Targets are based on the Department's *Strategic Plan* and may differ from the targets presented in the FSA *Annual Report*
**Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.
FFEL = Federal Family Education Loan.
Sources:
[1]Unit costs are derived from the Department's Activity-Based Management program using direct administrative costs. They do not include administrative overhead or investment/development costs.
[2]Based upon annual American Customer Satisfaction Index scores obtained through the CFI Group.
[3]The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year.

Measure 3.2.A.: Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid

Analysis of Progress: Federal Student Aid has made significant progress in its efforts to reduce the administrative unit costs. The actual unit cost for origination and disbursement is significantly lower than the baseline amount set in FY 2006. The Department anticipates an increase in costs and workload volumes in the coming years, as part of the new Direct Loan Initiative.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The actuals are the data reported as final in the current fiscal year. Because it takes some time after the closeout of the fiscal year to receive completed data and to validate results, the data lag by one year. For example, in FY 2009, the unit costs were based on data from FY 2008. To calculate the unit cost of Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid, the total amount spent on originating and disbursing Direct Loans and Grants is divided by the total number of Direct Loan and Grant disbursements.

Target Context: The target for this measure is expected to remain flat for FY 2010. Targets will be reviewed for the new *Strategic Plan*.

Measure 3.2.B.: Customer Service Level on the American Consumer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web

Analysis of Progress: The target was met for 2008. With an American Customer Satisfaction Index score of 83 (on a 1–100 scale), Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web scores in

the "Excellent" range in comparison to other entities that appear in the index. This category includes such high-performing companies as UPS, Amazon and Mercedes.

Data Quality and Timeliness: In 2008, the student aid applicants were asked through an electronic surveying capability their opinions about the experience directly after completing the online aid application. This new capability allowed the Department to obtain opinions directly after the experience rather than a month or more down the road and allowed it to expand the sample universe, yielding more accurate results.

Target Context: Targets are based upon American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) customer satisfaction scores and the Department expects to show slight improvement in the out years.

Measure 3.2.C.: Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate

Analysis of Progress: The Department did not meet its target. The improper payment rate that results from the Internal Revenue Service study is based on a randomly selected group of applicants each year. As such, the rate is subject to arbitrary fluctuations that reflect the randomness of the sample for any given year. The Department continues to make refinements to the application process that, based on the results of the study, will ultimately lead to a lower level of improper payments.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The FY 2009 Pell error rate is final at 3.5 percent.

Target Context: Target remains the same from FY 2006 to FY 2008. The FY 2009 target was not realized and 2010–2011 targets remain constant at 3.5 percent.

Measure 3.2.D.: Direct Loan Recovery Rate

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target of 20 percent was not met. This target was based, in part, on the expectation that a new collection system would be in place in 2009. The new system would have included more sophisticated collection tools. Data will now be collected through another process, with implementation during FY 2011.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported through the end of FY 2009 using the Default Management and Collections System (DMCS). A new service, which will include a new system, is being procured. The new service will enable FSA to manage its portfolio using methodologies, such as segmenting the portfolio and increasing overall collections. The new service is expected to improve FSA's productivity by streamlining processes, including invoices and workflow.

Target Context: The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year. The full extent of the economic downturn was not considered when the targets were originally established. This measure and out-year targets will be re-evaluated when developing the next *Strategic Plan*.

Measure 3.2.E.: FFEL Recovery Rate

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target of 19.75 percent was almost met, as reflected in the actual results of 19.70 percent.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are through the end of FY 2008.

Target Context: The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year. The full extent of the economic downturn was not considered when the targets were originally established and loan sales were not as high as expected.

Measures for Objective 3.3: Prepare adult learners and individuals with disabilities for higher education, employment and productive lives

			Results						Plan	
	(Years*)		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
3.3.A. Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program**	(2004)	66	71	82	76	79	78	Apr. 2010	80	82
3.3.B. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a High School Completion Goal Who Earn a High School Diploma or Recognized Equivalent	(2005) 46	51	52	59	53	62	54	Feb. 2010	55	56
3.3.C. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a Goal to Enter Postsecondary Education or Training Who Enroll in a Postsecondary Education or Training Program	(2005) 30	34	37	55	39	55	41	Feb. 2010	43	45
3.3.D. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With an Employment Goal Who Obtain a Job by the End of the First Quarter After Their Program Exit Quarter	(2005) 40	37	41	61	41	61	42	Feb. 2010	42	43

*Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.
**A state vocational rehabilitation agency meets the standard if at least 55.8 percent of individuals who have received services achieve an employment outcome.
Source: Vocational Rehabilitation agency data submitted to the Department's Rehabilitation Services Administration; Adult Education Annual Performance Report and Grantee Performance Reports.

Measure 3.3.A.: Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program

Analysis of Progress: In fiscal years 2007 and 2008, the percentage of general or combined state vocational rehabilitation agencies that met the performance criterion remained relatively constant at 82 percent and 79 percent, respectively. The percentage of general and combined vocational rehabilitation agencies that met the employment outcome standard in FY 2008 declined from 82 to 79 percent because two fewer agencies passed the standard due to more challenging economic conditions as well as a more difficult disability population being served. (Note: the FY 2006 number reported for FY 2007 in last year's report was 66 percent rather than 82 percent. The percentage was revised as a result of a miscalculation in prior years.)

Data Quality and Timeliness: State vocational rehabilitation agencies are required to submit their Rehabilitation Services Administration RSA-911 data by November 30 for the previous fiscal year. The data are considered very reliable because of the RSA editing process to which agency data are submitted. Data quality and timeliness have improved significantly in recent years. The RSA-911 database for fiscal years 2005 and 2006 was complete within 5 months of the close of fiscal year. Completion of the 2007 database was delayed because of late data submissions; however, RSA is working to ensure that the 2009 database is complete by February 2010 and available for timely analysis of performance data. Vocational rehabilitation data will be available in April 2010.

Target Context: The decline in employment outcomes had stabilized in 2005 with improving economic conditions and performance targets for 2008 and future years were raised, but they may have to be revisited with the current economic crisis, especially in employment.

Measure 3.3.B.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a High School Completion Goal Who Earn a High School Diploma or Recognized Equivalent

Analysis of Progress: The program exceeded its 2008 target as well as the 2007 actual performance data. Part of the explanation for the increase may stem from improved data collection methods used by states to collect and report on this measure through the National Reporting System for Adult Education.

Data Quality and Timeliness: As a third-tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Target Context: The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.

Measure 3.3.C.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a Goal to Enter Postsecondary Education or Training Who Enroll in a Postsecondary Education or Training Program

Analysis of Progress: The target has been met. There was a spike in the 2007 actual data. Factors include (1) improved follow-up methodologies implemented the states and (2) training and technical assistance by OVAE in providing support to states regarding methodologies related to transitioning adult students into postsecondary education and training opportunities.

During 2009, states maintained their data methodologies to support local entities and OVAE maintained its technical assistance in providing support to states regarding methodologies related to transitioning adult students into postsecondary education and training opportunities.

Data Quality and Timeliness: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Target Context: The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.

Measure 3.3.D.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With an Employment Goal Who Obtain a Job by the End of the First Quarter After Their Program Exit Quarter

Analysis of Progress: The target has been met. The actual data for 2008 exceeded the target and remained consistent with the actual data for 2007. There was a spike in the 2007 actual data. Factors include improved follow-up methodologies implemented by the states to collect and report employment. Prior to 2007, the performance data reflected the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal who, upon exit from an adult education program, obtained a job. States maintained their follow-up methodologies during 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Target Context: The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.

CROSS-GOAL STRATEGY ON MANAGEMENT

Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 4.1: Maintain and strengthen financial integrity and management and internal controls

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
4.1.A. Maintain an Unqualified (Clean) Audit Opinion[1]	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
4.1.B. Achieve and Maintain Compliance With the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002*[2]	*	NC	NC	NC	C	NC	C	NC	C	C
4.1.C. Percentage of New Discretionary Grants Awarded by June 30[3]	*	40	60	66	70	61	80	36	90	90

U = Unqualified (clean), NC = Non-compliant, C = Compliant.
*New Measures in FY 2007
Sources:
[1]Independent Auditors' annual financial statement audit report and related reports on internal control and compliance with laws and regulations.
[2]U.S. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General, annual *Federal Information Security Management Act* audit.
[3]U.S. Department of Education's Grant Administration and Payment System.

Measure 4.1.A.: Maintain an Unqualified (Clean) Audit Opinion

Analysis of Progress: The Department earned an eighth consecutive unqualified or "clean" audit opinion from independent auditors, thus meeting the FY 2009 target for this measure.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Independent auditors follow professional standards and conduct the audit under the oversight of the Department's Office of Inspector General. There are no data limitations.

Target Context: An unqualified or "clean" opinion means that the Department's financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Department in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States.

Measure 4.1.B.: Achieve and Maintain Compliance With the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002*

Analysis of Progress: The Department's Office of Inspector General has determined the Department to be noncompliant in fulfilling the requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* each year since the first evaluation in FY 2003 and this determination means that the Department did not meet its target. The Department is making progress in addressing OIG's concerns, having resolved fully more than 70 percent of the audit recommendations from FY 2005 through 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. § 3545, the Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) annually evaluates the effectiveness of the Department's information security program and practices. The evaluation includes testing of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures and practices of a representative subset of the agency's information systems, as well as an assessment of compliance with requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* and related information security policies based upon the testing performed.

Target Context: The Department has made significant progress in addressing OIG's concerns over the years. In instances where OIG has identified areas where improvements were needed, the Department has provided remediation to put in place effective security policies and procedures to protect the Department's IT assets.

Measure 4.1.C.: Percentage of New Discretionary Grants Awarded by June 30

Analysis of Progress: Concerted efforts by Department program managers to award new discretionary grants earlier in the fiscal year resulted in 66 percent of new FY 2007 awards being issued by June 30 of that fiscal year (three-fourths of the year complete). This exceeded the 60 percent FY 2007 target for this measure. In the previous four fiscal years, no more than 49 percent of new discretionary grants had been awarded by June 30. In FY 2008, the ambitious 70 percent target was not achieved by June 30, but the 61 percent award rate far exceeded the rates prior to FY 2007. In FY 2009, factors lowering the percentage were the addition of the *Recovery Act* funding administered by the same personnel as the Department grants, presidential transition and budgetary considerations associated with operation under a continuing resolution for the first quarter and part of the second quarter of FY 2009. Despite the percentage of grant awards at the June 30 mark, by August 31, 78 percent of discretionary grants were awarded, compared with 82 percent in FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Department's Office of the Chief Financial Officer regularly collects data via the Grant Administration and Payment System from principal offices with responsibilities for directing discretionary grant programs. During the second half of the fiscal year, data are distributed frequently to senior Department officials to ensure that planned award deadlines are met successfully.

Target Context: The Department has made a concerted effort in the past three years to expedite the processing of new discretionary grant awards. The Department aims to streamline the process further in future years to enable program staff to spend more time on program monitoring and performance improvements. The 2006 actual data served as the baseline for this measure.

Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 4.2: Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital

	(Years***)		FY 2007[2]		FY 2008[1]		FY 2009[2]		FY 2010	FY 2011
			Results						**Plan**	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Percentage of Employees Believing That:										
4.2.A. Leaders Generate High Levels of Motivation and Commitment*	(2006[1])	28	31	37	34	33	40	37	43	46
4.2.B. Managers Review and Evaluate the Organization's Progress Towards Meeting Its Goals and Objectives*	(2006)	53	56	58	59	56	68	51	71	74
4.2.C. Steps Are Taken to Deal With a Poor Performer Who Cannot or Will Not Improve*	(2006)	25	28	29	31	28	34	26	37	40
4.2.D. Department Policies and Programs Promote Diversity in the Workplace*	(2006)	46	49	48	52	51	56	48	59	62
4.2.E. They Are Held Accountable for Achieving Results*	(2006)	81	82	82	83	84	85	84	86	87
4.2.F. The Workforce Has the Job-Relevant Knowledge and Skills Necessary to Accomplish Organizational Goals*	(2006)	67	69	70	71	70	72	68	74	76
4.2.G. Average Number of Days to Hire Is at or Below the OPM 45-Day Hiring Model for Non-SES**	(2006)	Not Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
4.2.H. Percentage of Employees With Performance Standards in Place Within 30 Days of Start of Current Rating Cycle[3]	(2005)	79	85	59	90	93	95	95	97	98

	Results								Plan	
	(Years***)		FY 2007[2]		FY 2008[1]		FY 2009[2]		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
4.2.I. Percentage of Employees Who Have Ratings of Record in the System Within 30 Days of Close of Rating Cycle[4]	(2005)	85	90	97	95	98	99	96	100	100

*These metrics are based on the percentage of favorable response to questions on the Federal Human Capital Survey and the Department's Annual Employee Survey. The Department's 2006 responses (Departmentwide) are used as the baseline.
**The Office of Personnel Management 45-day hiring model for non-SES tracks the hiring process from the date of vacancy announcement closing to the date a job offer is extended. It is measured in workdays, not calendar days. The average is based on the total number of hires made within a specified period of time (quarterly).
***Years indicates the years that baseline target was established.
Sources:
[1]Federal Human Capital Survey.
[2]Annual Department Employee Surveys.
[3]Data from the Education Department Performance Appraisal System.
[4]U.S. Department of the Interior's Federal Personnel Payroll System.

Measures 4.2.A.–4.2.F: Improve the Strategic Management of the Department's Human Capital

Analysis of Progress: Department employees indicated slightly lower agreement with four of the six measure statements in the 2009 Annual Employee Survey than they had in the 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey. Targets for two measures were met and progress for one measure was missed but the result remained the same as in 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The 84-item Federal Human Capital Survey is conducted in even-numbered years by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM); in 2008, the Department of Education had a 69 percent response rate. In odd-numbered years, the Department conducts the Annual Employee Survey with 56 items duplicated exactly from the biennial federal survey, plus additional agency-specific items can be added. The 2009 survey had 87 items including first-time questions related to two Department-level programs—the Equal Employment Opportunity Program and the Informal Dispute Resolution Center. In 2009, the response rate for the Annual Employee Survey was 61 percent, which indicates a high level of employee engagement according to the Hay Group and the Partnership for Public Service. The six survey items included among the measures are present on both surveys and were selected by the Department in consultation with OPM as major qualitative indicators of employee satisfaction. For more information on 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey or the 2009 Annual Employee Survey, go to http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/otherplanrpts.html.

Target Context: The targets and data above reflect the percentage of favorable responses (either "strongly agree" or "agree") to the selected items on the employee surveys. The Department used 2006 Federal Human Capital Survey data to establish baselines for the above measures.

Measure 4.2.G.: Average Number of Days to Hire Is at or Below the OPM 45-Day Hiring Model for Non-SES

Analysis of Progress: The Department met the goal of the OPM hiring model: in 2007, with an average hiring time of 27 business days; in 2008, with a revised average hiring time of 28 business days; and in 2009, with an average hiring time of 26 business days. In 2008, the Department restructured the Human Resources Services (HRS) office, which enabled additional resources to focus on improving the staffing process. Improved interaction over time between the Human Resources Specialists and principal office managers is also credited with enabling hiring process improvements. Furthermore, HRS tracks the hiring

cycles for each principal office and provides them with monthly reports on hiring progress. These actions provide continual incentives to shorten the hiring process.

Data Quality and Timeliness: For this measure, the Department tracks progress against the 45-day hiring model for positions other than the Senior Executive Service. The model tracks the hiring process from the closing date of the vacancy announcement to the date a job offer is extended. It is measured in business days rather than calendar days and is calculated quarterly based on an average process length of all hires completed within that quarter.

Target Context: When the Department's revised strategic plan was being developed, the median of the average hiring time for the four most recent quarters then known (July 2005 through June 2006) was 54 days. This data point was used to establish the 2006 baseline for this measure, which indicated that the Department had not achieved the standard.

Measure 4.2.H.: Percentage of Employees With Performance Standards in Place Within 30 Days of Start of Current Rating Cycle

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was met. After an unexpected decline in 2007 that fell well short of the target percentage, the Department rebounded to exceed an even higher target in 2008 and held steady in FY 2009. The inclusion of this measure as a component in the Organizational Assessment rating for each principal office beginning in 2007, which first affected this measure for 2008, likely provided an incentive toward timely completion of performance standards.

Data Quality and Timeliness: To be considered successful on this measure, a Department employee or his or her supervisor must establish performance standards that align with the *Strategic Plan* and are approved by the supervisor. These standards must be entered no more than 30 days into the fiscal year covered by the measure. SES employees are not included in this measure. Effective October 1, 2007, the 12-month period on which employee performance is assessed aligns with the federal fiscal year.

Target Context: This measure was a component of measure 6.2.A. from the Department's previous *Strategic Plan*, which comprised an index of Department human capital activities and was measured in FY 2005 through FY 2007. The 2005 actual data served as the baseline for this measure.

Measure 4.2.I.: Percentage of Employees Who Have Ratings of Record in the System Within 30 Days of Close of Rating Cycle

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was not met. The FY 2008 target was exceeded. After an unexpected decline to 54 percent in 2006 that fell well short of expectations (see Target Context), the Department rebounded to exceed the measure's target in 2007. The inclusion of this measure as a component in the Organizational Assessment rating for each principal office beginning in 2007 likely provided an incentive toward timely completion of ratings.

Data Quality and Timeliness: To be considered successful on this measure, an employee rating of the level of success achieved on established performance standards must be entered no more than 30 days after the fiscal year covered by the measure. SES employees are not included in this measure. Effective October 1, 2007, the 12-month period on which employee performance is assessed aligns with the federal fiscal year.

Target Context: This measure was a component of measure 6.2.A. from the Department's previous *Strategic Plan*, which comprised an index of Department human capital activities and was measured in FY 2005 through FY 2007. The 2005 actual data served as the baseline for this measure.

Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 3: Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
4.3.A. Percentage of Department Program Dollars in Programs That Demonstrate Effectiveness in Terms of Outcomes, Either on Performance Indicators or through Rigorous Evaluations	79	86	79	86	86	88	86	88	87*	88*

*Pending Office of Management and Budget action on program performance ratings.
Source: U.S. Department of Education, analysis of Program Assessment Rating Tool findings.

Analysis of Progress: As of October 2008, 91 funded Department programs had undergone a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review, representing 98 percent of the Department's FY 2008 budget authority for programs subject to the PART. Although 45 currently funded programs (constituting 88 percent of this budget authority) were rated *Adequate* or higher in their PART reviews, enabling the Department to exceed its target for FY 2008, four programs were rated *Ineffective* and 42 programs were rated *Results Not Demonstrated.*

Data Quality and Timeliness: Calculation is based on dollars in Department programs with at least an *Adequate* PART rating in the given year divided by dollars in all Department programs rated through that year. The PART assessment cycle occurs during the spring and summer and OMB makes scores public via http://www.expectmore.gov. OMB allows the Department to report aggregated results from a year's assessments in time for publication in that year's *Performance and Accountability Report.*

Target Context: The Department determines the measure of effectiveness from the proportion of FY 2009 PART-eligible program budget authority that supports programs with an *Adequate* or higher rating from the PART analysis. This standard is used because such programs produce evidence of effectiveness with data from performance measures and rigorous program evaluations, unlike programs that have insufficient performance or evaluation data or for which data indicate ineffectiveness. The rationale for the target remaining steady for FY 2009 compared with the two previous years is that nearly all program dollars subject to PART have been rated and subsequent changes will likely be incremental based upon selected program reassessments. The PART process is currently under governmentwide review and subject to possible revisions during FY 2010.

Appendices

APPENDIX A1: SUMMARY OF INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDITS AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORTS BY GOAL

For all Department of Education Inspector General reports for FY 2009, please visit the Inspector General's Web site at http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/reports.html and http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/reports.html.

For Government Accountability Office reports on education for FY 2009, please visit GAO's Web site at http://www.gao.gov/docsearch/agency.php.

Summary of Major FY 2009 OIG Audits and Reports

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Federal Student Aid's Performance as a Performance-Based Organization (ED OIG/A19H0008) December 2008	3	Determine whether FSA is meeting its responsibilities under Title I, Part D of the *Higher Education Act* (*HEA*), as amended, related to planning and reporting, systems integration and cost reduction. In response to the growing complexity, increasing demand and the likelihood for fraud, waste and abuse associated with student financial assistance programs, Congress amended the *HEA* in 1998 to create a performance-based organization (PBO) to manage and administer student financial assistance programs authorized under Title IV of the *HEA*. As the designated PBO, FSA operates without the constraints of certain rules and regulations for the purpose of achieving specific measurable goals and objectives.	To correct the weaknesses identified, the Inspector General (IG) recommended that the Under Secretary ensure the Acting Chief Operating Officer takes action to, among other things: implement controls to ensure Five-Year Plans include measurable and quantifiable strategic objectives, Annual Plans correlate with Five-Year Plans and Annual Reports clearly convey the extent of meeting specific goals and objectives; ensure staff responsible for planning and reporting on FSA's performance are familiar with GPRA requirements; provide the most recently available rating and bonus information for the COO and each of the senior managers in the Annual Reports; identify recommendations for legislative and regulatory changes in each Annual Report; establish procedures and controls to ensure the feasibility of major system integration efforts; report savings from major system initiatives to facilitate tracking of planned savings to actual savings; and • include appropriate transition clauses in all future contracts to avoid unnecessary transition costs.	In its response to the draft audit report, FSA stated, in general, that it agreed with many of the comments in the report and provided a corrective action plan to address each of the recommendations. While FSA acknowledged that the development of a comprehensive strategic and tactical planning, tracking and reporting structure for FSA has been evolutionary, FSA disagreed that it was not meeting its responsibilities as outlined under the PBO legislation. FSA stated it has worked with OIG to continually refine both the Five-Year Plan and Final Report ED-OIG/A19H0008. FSA also stated that OIG has reviewed and ultimately approved every Five-Year Plan and Annual Report produced during the time in question. In addition, since 2005, FSA stated every accomplishment listed in the MD&A section of the Annual Report was audited, verified and approved by an OIG auditor and extensive supporting documentation was provided to support every accomplishment.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2009/a19h0008.pdf

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Federal Student Aid's Oversight and Monitoring of Guaranty Agencies, Lenders, and Servicers Needs Improvement (ED OIG/A20I0001) April 2009	3	To evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of FSA internal control to ensure that guaranty agencies, lenders and servicers are performing in accordance with relevant laws, regulations and guidance. The IG audit covered the period from October 1, 2006, through March 31, 2008.	Improvement is needed in oversight of Federal Family Education Loan. Improvement is needed in the Financial Partners Eligibility & Oversight Risk Assessment process. Control Activities Over Guaranty Agencies, Lenders and Servicers need improvement. FSA lacked written procedures on sharing information related to policy guidance and program reviews.	The Department submitted a revised Corrective Action Plan to address the findings in the report.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2009/a20i0001.pdf
Review of Federal Student Aid's Enterprise Risk Management Program (ED OIG/I13I005) May 2009	3	The purpose of this final management information report is to present the results of the IG review of Federal Student Aid's Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program and FSA's response to those results.	The ERM group's work has not addressed the specific elements of the Internal Environment, which serves as a basis for all other components of enterprise risk management. The ERM group has not ensured that FSA has a defined risk management philosophy or risk appetite and has not given attention to existing information on Internal Environment, such as FSA-wide surveys indicating that there are perceptions on the part of FSA staff.	The Department stated that the process of implementing an ERM program is one of continuous enhancement, refinement and adoption of best practices, and it has shared progress with the OIG's inspection team in order to further improve the ERM Program based on the feedback provided.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/aireports/i13i0005.pdf

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Special Allowance Payments to Sallie Mae's Subsidiary, Nellie Mae, for Loans Funded by Tax-Exempt Obligations (ED OIG/A03I0006) August 2009	3	To determine if Nellie Mae, a subsidiary of Sallie Mae, Inc. (SLMA), (1) billed loans under the 9.5-percent floor in compliance with the *Taxpayer-Teacher Protection Act of 2004* (*TTPA*) and the *Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005* (*HERA*) and (2) billed loans under the 9.5 percent floor after the eligible tax-exempt bonds from which the loans derived their eligibility matured or were retired. The audit period covered October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2006.	OIG recommends that the Chief Operating Officer for Federal Student Aid instruct SLMA to adjust its special allowance billings for loans identified in the finding and return all overpayments to the Department, estimated to be about $12 million; identify additional loans ineligible for the 9.5-percent floor calculation, as described in the finding, and adjust its special allowance billings for the affected loans in the quarters ended June 30, 2002, through June 30, 2005, and return all overpayments to the Department, estimated to be about $10 million; and disclose any other instances of subsidiaries of loans billed under the 9.5 percent floor calculation after the eligible tax-exempt bond issue matured and after the loans were refinanced with funds derived from an ineligible funding source and, if necessary, adjust its special allowance billings for all affected loans and return all overpayments to the Department.	Response pending	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2009/a03i0006.pdf
Incident Handling and Privacy Act Controls over External Web Sites (ED OIG/ A11H0006) June 2009	4	Based on the IG review, the Department's Chief Information Officer (CIO) must improve security controls over the incident response and handling program and accelerate two-factor authentication for protecting Privacy Act information to adequately protect the confidentiality, integrity and availability of the personally identifiable information (PII) data residing on public Web sites.	The Department did not properly establish and maintain public domain Web sites. Specifically, the Department did not (a) properly track, update and verify a directory of public Web sites; (b) properly control internet protocol address assignment; (c) properly issue and administer Web site certificates; (d) properly monitor public domain Web sites; and (e) use approved domain names.	The Department also stated it concurred, as of the start date of this audit, with the findings and recommendations identified. In response to the system security review, management stated that corrective action plans for the weaknesses will be finalized through the Department's normal audit resolution process.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2009/a11i0006.pdf

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Reliability of Cost and Benefit Information in the U.S. Department of Education's Information Technology Investment Exhibit 300s (ED OIG/A04H0018) July 2009	4	To determine whether the cost information presented in the Department's exhibit 300s, including the estimated benefits of system development efforts, is (1) based on reasonably accurate, reliable, and complete cost and benefit data and (2) independently validated prior to submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The audits covered selected exhibit 300s submitted to OMB through September 2007 for selected IT investments.	OIG found that four of the six selected offices (OCFO, OESE, IES and FSA) within the Department did not report cumulative project costs in 14 of 55 total exhibit 300s reviewed for the 10 selected investments.	OCIO concurred with the finding and recommendations. In response to the recommendations, OCIO stated that in April 2008 it provided an FY 2010 Exhibit 300 Guidance document to all project managers that addressed the reporting of cumulative project cost and the performance and reporting of alternatives analyses, including the requirement for benefits associated with each alternative reported.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2009/a04h0018.pdf
Audit of the Department's Process to Resolve Lapsed Funds (ED OIG/A19H0010) August 2009	4	To evaluate the effectiveness of the process used by the Department to resolve lapsed funds, including an evaluation of the Department's process for reviewing grantee requests for late liquidation of funds and its process to notify grant recipients of award balances about to become unavailable.	Develop and implement internal policy to: ensure consistency in receipt, processing, decision making and outcome-related correspondence processes for late liquidation requests across the Department and implement a training program to reinforce the requirements of the internal late liquidation policy to applicable Department staff once the policy is developed, also to post a memoradum on the Department's intranet for accessibility.	The Department has taken actions to improve the late liquidation process in response to a previous OIG audit report, and significant improvement has been made as measured by the percentage of available funding to be cancelled. In January 2009 a Departmental Directive was drafted that will address concerns regarding the management of late liquidation requests.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2009/a19h0010.pdf

Summary of Major FY 2009 GAO Reports

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Recovery Act: *States' and Localities' Current and Planned Uses of Funds While Facing Fiscal Stresses (GAO-09-829) July 2009*	RA	In response to a mandate under the *Recovery Act*, the report addresses the following objectives: (1) selected states' and localities' uses of *Recovery Act* funds, (2) the approaches taken by the selected states and localities to ensure accountability for *Recovery Act* funds and (3) states' plans to evaluate the impact of the *Recovery Act* funds they received.	GAO recommends a list of action that OMB and Congress should take to increase transparency and accountability and measure impact of reporting on the *Recovery Act*. GAO analyzed federal agency guidance and spoke with OMB officials and with relevant program officials at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the U.S. Departments of Education, Energy, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Labor and Transportation (DOT).	Department officials noted that draft OMB guidance on recipient reporting would require some additional Department guidance to clarify issues for recipients of formula grants, such as special education (*IDEA*), elementary and secondary education (*ESEA*) and State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (*SFSF*) grants.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09829.pdf
Recovery Act*: Funds Continue to Provide Fiscal Relief to States and Localities, While Accountability and Reporting Challenges Need to Be Fully Addressed (GAO-09-1016) September 2009*	RA	This report, the third in response to a mandate under the *Recovery Act*, addresses the following objectives: (1) selected states' and localities' uses of *Recovery Act* funds, (2) the approaches taken by the selected states and localities to ensure accountability for *Recovery Act* funds and (3) states' plans to evaluate the impact of *Recovery Act* funds.	State Fiscal Stabilization Fund: GAO recommends that the Department take further action to ensure states understand and carry out their responsibility to monitor subrecipients of SFSF funds and consider providing training and technical assistance to states to help them develop state monitoring plans for SFSF.	The Department noted that it is taking steps to address GAO's recommendations.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d091016.pdf and http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d091017sp.pdf

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Disaster Assistance: Federal Efforts to Assist Group Site Residents With Employment, Services for Families With Children, and Transportation (GAO-09-81) December 2008	1	This report focuses on the federal government's efforts to assist group site residents with employment, services for families with children and transportation. This report addresses three key questions: (1) What is known about the number and location of the group sites and their residents? (2) What did the federal government do to assist group site residents with employment, services for families with children and transportation? (3) What challenges did federal and state agencies face in providing this assistance to group site residents?	The report does not include recommendations.	No recommendations were addressed to the Department.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0981.pdf
Access to Arts Education: Inclusion of Additional Questions in Education's Planned Research Would Help Explain Why Instruction Time Has Decreased for Some Students (GAO-09-286) February 2009	1	*No Child Left Behind Act* (*NCLB*): GAO was asked to determine how, if at all, student access to arts education has changed since *NCLB*, specifically: (1) Has the amount of instruction time for arts education changed and, if so, have certain groups been more affected than others? (2) To what extent have state education agencies' requirements and funding for arts education changed since *NCLB*? (3) What are school officials in selected districts doing to provide arts education since *NCLB* and what challenges do they face in doing so? and (4) What is known about the effect of arts education in improving student outcomes?	GAO recommends that the Secretary of Education require the Department's planned study of *NCLB* implementation to ask survey respondents why any changes in instruction time they report occurred.	The Department generally agreed with the recommendation.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09286.pdf

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Teacher Quality: Sustained Coordination among Key Federal Education Programs Could Enhance State Efforts to Improve Teacher Quality (GAO-09-593) July 2009	1	GAO's objectives included examining (1) the extent to which the Department funds and coordinates teacher quality programs, (2) studies that the Department conducts on teacher quality and how it provides and coordinates research-related assistance to states and school districts and (3) challenges to collaboration within states and how the Department helps address those challenges.	GAO recommends that the Secretary of Education implement a strategy for sustained coordination among program offices. Key purposes would be to aid information and resource sharing and to strengthen linkages among its efforts to help improve teacher quality.	The Department will consider forming a cross-program group but favors issue-specific coordination.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09593.pdf
Teacher Preparation: Multiple Federal Education Offices Support Teacher Preparation for Instructing Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners, but Systematic Departmentwide Coordination Could Enhance This Assistance (GAO-09-573) July 2009	1	GAO was asked to examine (1) the extent to which teacher preparation programs require preparation for general classroom teachers to instruct student subgroups, (2) the role selected states play in preparing general classroom teachers to instruct these student subgroups and (3) funding and other assistance provided by the Department to help general classroom teachers instruct these student subgroups.	GAO recommends that the Secretary develop and implement a mechanism to ensure more systematic coordination among program offices that oversee assistance that can help general classroom teachers to instruct student subgroups.	The Department agreed that coordination is beneficial and will explore the benefits of creating such a mechanism.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09573.pdf
School Meal Programs: Changes to Federal Agencies' Procedures Could Reduce Risk of School Children Consuming Recalled Food (GAO-09-649) August 2009	1	GAO was asked to determine how federal agencies (1) notified states and schools about food recalls, (2) advised states and schools about disposal and reimbursement of recalled food and (3) ensured that recalls were being carried out effectively.	GAO recommends that the Agriculture Department improve notification procedures and instructions on carrying out recalls. GAO also recommends specific steps that the Departments of Agriculture and Health and Human Services take to improve monitoring of the effectiveness of recalls.	No recommendations were addressed to the Department.	http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-09-649

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
No Child Left Behind Act: *Enhancements in the Department of Education's Review Process Could Improve State Academic Assessments (GAO-09-911) September 2009*	1	The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (*NCLB*) requires states to develop high-quality academic assessments aligned with state academic standards. The Department has provided states with about $400 million for *NCLB* assessment implementation every year since 2002. GAO examined (1) changes in reported state expenditures on assessments, and how states have spent funds; (2) factors states have considered in making decisions about question (item) type and assessment content; (3) challenges states have faced in ensuring that their assessments are valid and reliable and (4) the extent to which the Department has supported state efforts to comply with assessment requirements.	GAO recommends that the Department (1) incorporate assessment security best practices into its peer review protocols, (2) improve communication during the review process and (3) identify for states why its peer review decisions in some cases differed from peer reviewers' written comments.	The Department continues to monitor test security practices during monitoring visits, issues findings to the states with weak or incomplete test security practices and requires corrective action by states with monitoring findings. The Department provides feedback to state assessment officials and discusses submissions to correct misconceptions before completion of peer review. The Department is looking into the possibility of using a secure server for state officials to submit questions, documents and other evidence.	http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-09-911
Federal Student Aid: Recent Changes to Eligibility Requirements and Additional Efforts to Promote Awareness Could Increase Academic Competitiveness and SMART Grant Participation (GAO-09-343) March 2009	3	The Academic Competitiveness (AC) and National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART) grants provide merit-based financial aid to certain low-income college students eligible for Federal Pell Grants and are administered by the Department. In the first year of implementation, participation was lower than expected. GAO was asked to determine (1) factors affecting AC and SMART Grant student participation, (2) challenges colleges face in administering the grant programs and (3) the extent to which the Department has assisted states and colleges with implementation.	GAO recommends that the Department (1) develop a strategy to increase awareness of these grant programs among states and high schools and (2) use existing forums to facilitate the sharing of effective practices among states and colleges to help mitigate some of the administrative challenges of verifying the grants' requirements.	The Department agreed with the recommendations.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09343.pdf

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Higher Education: Approaches to Attract and Fund International Students in the United States and Abroad (GAO-09-379) April 2009	3	To provide insight on how higher education is used to advance public diplomacy and development assistance goals, GAO examined (1) the objectives the United States and selected peer governments seek to advance through higher education for international students and the approaches they employ to attract international students and (2) the characteristics of major U.S. and peer government programs that fund higher education for international students to support public diplomacy and development goals.	This report does not contain recommendations. Technical comments from officials representing the programs discussed in this report were incorporated as appropriate.	The report includes no specific recommendations for the Department to address.	http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-09-379
Career and Technical Education: States Have Broad Flexibility in Implementing Perkins IV (GAO-09-683) July 2009	3	GAO examined how states have implemented Perkins IV performance measures and what challenges, if any, they have faced; to what extent the Department has ensured that states are implementing performance measures and supported states in their efforts; and what the Department knows about the effectiveness of CTE programs.	Perkins requires states to report on how they are evaluating their programs and does not provide guidance on how states should evaluate their programs or require that states report on the outcomes of their evaluations. The Department is working with states to help them overcome challenges in collecting and reporting student outcomes, and over time, states may collect more consistent data for measures such as technical skill attainment. The report contains no recommendations.	The Department provided technical comments on the report.	http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-09-683
English Language Learning: Diverse Federal and State Efforts to Support Adult English Language Learning Could Benefit From More Coordination (GAO-09-575) July 2009	3	GAO examined trends in the need for and enrollment in federally funded adult English language programs, the nature of federal support for adult English language learning, ways in which states and local public providers have supported English language programs for adults and federal agencies' plans for research to identify effective approaches to adult English language learning.	GAO recommends that the Department work with HHS, Labor and other agencies as appropriate to develop coordinated approaches for sharing information and planning and conducting research.	The agencies concurred with the recommendations and cited intentions to work together toward their implementation.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09575.pdf

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Low-Income and Minority Serving Institutions: Management Attention to Long-Standing Concerns Needed to Improve Education's Oversight of Grant Programs (GAO-09-309) August 2009	3	GAO was asked to determine (1) the characteristics of institutions eligible to receive grants under Titles III and V and characteristics of students served; (2) any challenges grantees face and how they spent Title III and V funds to address these challenges and (3) the extent to which the Department monitors the financial and programmatic performance of grantees and uses this information to target its technical assistance.	GAO recommends that the Department develop a comprehensive, risk-based approach to target monitoring and technical assistance, follow up on improper uses of grant funds identified in this report, ensure staff training needs are fully met, disseminate information about implementation challenges and successful projects to grantees and develop appropriate feedback mechanisms.	The Department indicated that it has taken corrective actions, such as convening a task force to better coordinate program resources toward grantees most in need of monitoring and/or technical assistance. The Department agreed to provide additional training to new and existing program staff, reinstitute the annual Title III and V Project Director's meeting in an effort to better disseminate information about the program and successful grants and implement an e-mail address that grantees can use to provide feedback.	http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-09-309
Proprietary Schools: Stronger Department of Education Oversight Needed to Help Ensure Only Eligible Students Receive Federal Student Aid (GAO-09-600) August 2009	3	Given interest in learning more about proprietary schools, GAO examined: (1) how the student loan default profile of proprietary schools compares with that of other types of schools and (2) the extent to which Education's policies and procedures for monitoring eligibility requirements for federal aid at proprietary schools protect students and the investment of Title IV funds.	GAO recommends the Department (1) improve its monitoring of basic skills tests and target schools for further review, (2) revise regulations to strengthen controls over basic skills tests and (3) provide information and guidance on valid high school diplomas for use in gaining access to federal student aid.	The Department noted the steps it would take to address GAO's recommendations.	http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-09-600

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Vocational Rehabilitation Funding Formula: Options for Improving Equity in State Grants and Considerations for Performance Incentives (GAO-09-798) September 2009	3	State vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies play a crucial role in helping individuals with disabilities obtain employment. In FY 2008, the Department distributed more than $2.8 billion in grants to state agencies, using a funding formula that was last revised in 1978. Questions have been raised about whether this formula is outdated, allocates funds equitably and adequately accounts for state agencies' performance. GAO was asked to (1) examine the extent to which the current formula meets generally accepted equity standards, (2) present options for revising the formula and (3) identify issues to consider with incorporating performance incentives into the formula.	GAO makes no recommendations in this report.		http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09798.pdf
Federal Contractors: Better Performance Information Needed to Support Agency Contract Award Decisions (GAO-09-374) April 2009	4	While actions have been taken to improve the sharing of past performance information and its use—including the development of the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)—concerns remain about this information. This report assesses agencies' use of past performance information in awarding contracts, identifies challenges that hinder systematic sharing of past performance information and describes efforts to improve contractor performance information.	GAO is making recommendations to the Office of Federal Procurement Policy and selected agencies aimed at facilitating sharing and use of past performance information. All agencies agreed with the recommendations.	The report includes no specific recommendations for the Department to address.	http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-09-374

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Department's Response	Link to the Report
Information Technology: Federal Agencies Need to Strengthen Investment Board Oversight of Poorly Planned and Performing Projects (GAO-09-566) June 2009	4	GAO was asked to determine whether (1) federal departments and agencies have guidance on the role of their department-level investment review boards in selecting and overseeing IT projects and (2) these boards are performing reviews of poorly planned and poorly performing projects.	The Department was asked to review the Common Services for Borrowers project, which was identified as one IT project among many throughout the government that was not subject to department-level board representation and selection and oversight processes.	The Department responded that the Common Services for Borrowers project did not receive a selection review by the department-level board because it is under the oversight of the Federal Student Aid Executive Leadership Team. The Department stated that it plans to bring all of its IT investments under the department-level board's oversight.	http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09566.pdf

APPENDIX A2: SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS BY GOAL

Summary of Major FY 2009 Program Evaluations and Studies

For a complete list of program evaluations and studies from the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, please visit http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html. For a complete list of evaluation studies of the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, please visit http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/index.asp.

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
The Evaluation of the Comprehensive School Reform Program Implementation and Outcomes: Third Year Report (2008)	1	Provides third-year study findings regarding schools receiving comprehensive school reform (CSR) assistance awards in 2002, focusing on (1) how the CSR award receipt was related to subsequent changes in achievement and (2) whether or not aspects of program implementation were associated with achievement gains. Findings are based on analyses of survey, case study and assessment data collected from grantees and comparison schools from fall 2002 through spring 2005.	Key findings: (1) Receipt of a CSR award was not associated with gains in mathematics or reading achievement through the first three years of award. (2) There was limited evidence that schools adopting models with scientific evidence of effectiveness experienced positive gains, especially in math.	http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/other/csrd-outcomes/year3-report.pdf
Technical Methods Reports Series (various dates)	1	Large-scale evaluations of education programs and practices supported by federal funds; provides research-based technical assistance to educators and policymakers.	Reports address current methodological questions and offer guidance to resolving or advancing the application of high-quality evaluation methods in varying educational contexts.	http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
The Evaluation of Enhanced Academic Instruction in After-School Programs Final Report (2009)	1	The primary purpose of this study is to determine whether providing structured academic instruction in reading or math to students in grades 2 to 5 during their after-school hours—instead of the less formal academic supports offered in regular after-school programs—improves their academic performance in the subject. This is the second and final report from the Evaluation of Enhanced Academic Instruction in After-School Programs—a two-year demonstration and random assignment evaluation of structured approaches to teaching math and reading in after-school settings.	One year of enhanced instruction in math produces positive and statistically significant impacts on student achievement. Two years of the enhanced program produce no additional achievement benefit beyond the one-year impact. Students in the enhanced programs received math and reading instruction that was more structured and intensive than regular after-school students. The enhanced reading program has no impact on total reading test scores after one year of participation. Two years of participation produces significantly fewer gains in reading achievement for students in the enhanced program group.	http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20094077/pdf/20094077.pdf
Effectiveness of Selected Supplemental Reading Comprehension Interventions: Impacts on a First Cohort of Fifth-Grade Students (2009)	1	Reports on the impacts on student achievement for four supplemental reading curricula that use similar overlapping instructional strategies designed to improve reading comprehension in social studies and science text.	Fifth-grade reading comprehension for each of three commercially available curricula (Project CRISS, ReadAbout and Read for Real) was not significantly different from the control group. The fourth curriculum, Reading for Knowledge, was adapted from Success for All for this study and had a statistically significant negative impact on fifth-grade reading comprehension.	http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20094032/pdf/20094032.pdf

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act*, Volume VIII-Teacher Quality Under* NCLB: *Final Report (2009)*	1	Provides updated information on the progress that states, districts and schools have made in implementing *NCLB*'s teacher quality, professional development and paraprofessional provisions. The report is based on the second round of data collection from the National Longitudinal Study of *NCLB* and the Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under *NCLB*. The report presents findings from interviews with state education officials in all states and surveys of nationally representative samples of districts, principals and teachers conducted in 2004–05 and 2006–07.	Key findings include: (1) By 2006–07, the vast majority of teachers met their states' requirements to be considered highly qualified under *NCLB*. (2) State requirements for the demonstration of content-knowledge expertise varied greatly. (3) Teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools were more likely to report that they were not highly qualified. (4) Even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught. (5) Nearly all teachers reported taking part in content-focused professional development related to reading or mathematics during the 2005–06 school year and summer; a relatively small proportion participated in extended sessions.	http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/report.pdf
Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings (2009)	1	Provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The report presents data collected in 2006–07 through the National Longitudinal Study of *NCLB* and the Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under *NCLB*. The report includes findings from interviews with state education officials in all states; surveys of nationally representative samples of districts, principals and teachers; data from consolidated state performance reports; and analyses of student achievement trends on state assessments and NAEP.	In states with consistent achievement trend data from 2004–05 to 2006–07, the percentage of students reaching the state's proficient level rose for most student groups, but most states would not meet *NCLB*'s goal of 100-percent proficiency by 2013–14 unless student achievement increases at a faster rate. Nearly 11,000 Title I schools were identified for improvement in 2006–07, and almost half were in the more advanced stages of corrective action and restructuring. Student participation in Title I school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) continues to rise, and district expenditures on these choice options doubled from 2003–04 to 2005–06.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#title

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
State and Local Implementation of the* No Child Left Behind Act*, Volume VI—Targeting and Uses of Federal Education Funds (2009)	1	Examines how well federal funds are targeted to districts and schools serving economically disadvantaged students, how Title I targeting has changed over the past seven years, how districts have spent federal funds and the base of state and local resources to which federal funds are added. The report covers six federal programs: Title I, Part A; Reading First; Comprehensive School Reform (CSR); Title II, Part A; Title III, Part A; and Perkins Vocational Education State Grants.	Key findings include: (1) Federal education funds were more strongly targeted to high-poverty districts than were state and local funds; however, the higher level of federal funding in high-poverty districts was not sufficient to close the funding gap between high- and low-poverty districts. (2) The overall share of Title I funds going to the highest-poverty districts and schools changed little between 1997–98 and 2004–05, and the highest-poverty schools continued to receive smaller Title I allocations per low-income student than did the lowest-poverty schools.	http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/nclb-targeting/nclb-targeting.pdf
Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction Results From the Second Year of a Randomized Controlled Study (2009)	1	Compares outcomes of teachers offered intensive induction activities with full-time mentors to those of teachers with less intensive, less structured induction activities using an experimental study design.	There was no impact on teacher retention rates or overall student achievement.	http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20094072/pdf/20094072.pdf
The Impacts of Regular Upward Bound on Postsecondary Outcomes 7–9 Years After Scheduled High School Graduation: Final Report (2009)	2	The study findings are based on a random assignment design implemented in a nationally representative sample of 67 Upward Bound projects hosted by two- and four-year colleges and universities. About 1,500 eligible applicants were randomly assigned to the evaluation's treatment group and were allowed to participate in Upward Bound, and about 1,300 students were randomly assigned to the control group.	The study concluded that Upward Bound (1) had no detectable effect on the rate of overall postsecondary enrollment or the type or selectivity of postsecondary institution attended; (2) increased the likelihood of earning a postsecondary certificate or license from a vocational school but had no detectable effect on the likelihood of earning a bachelor's or associate's degree; and (3) increased postsecondary enrollment and completion for students with lower educational expectations at baseline.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#higher

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
Academic Competitiveness and SMART Grant Programs: First-Year Lessons Learned (2009)	3	Academic Competitiveness Grants (ACG) and National SMART Grants (NSG) were created in the *Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005* (*HERA*). ACGs are intended to encourage students to take more challenging courses in high school, making success in college more likely. NSGs are intended to encourage post-secondary students to take college majors in high demand in the global economy, such as science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) and critical foreign languages. Students eligible for Pell Grants who completed a "rigorous program of study" in high school received an ACG of up to $750 in their first year and, if they earned a 3.0 or better grade point average (GPA), up to $1,300 in their second year. Pell-eligible students who majored in a STEM field or critical foreign language and maintained a 3.0 GPA received an NSG for up to $4,000 for their third and fourth years.	Key findings: (1) Given the rapid implementation of the programs, many stakeholders reported difficulties in identifying eligible students. (2) Of the $790 million appropriated for these programs for the initial year FY 2006, approximately $448 million (57 percent) was disbursed. (3) Fewer students received awards than estimated: About 300,000 ACGs and 60,000 NSGs were awarded, as compared to initial budget estimates of 425,000 ACGs and 80,000 NSGs. (4) About three-quarters of ACG recipients were first-year students, suggesting that second-year students had difficulty meeting the 3.0 GPA requirements. (5) Of 3,600 postsecondary institutions eligible to award Pell Grants and ACGs, about 2,800 (78 percent) participated.	http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/acsmartyear1/acsmart.pdf

APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACG	Academic Competitiveness Grant
ACSI	American Customer Satisfaction Index
AFR	*Agency Financial Report*
AGI	Adjusted Gross Income
AP	Advanced Placement
APR	*Annual Performance Report*
ARRA	*American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (*Recovery Act*)
ATA	*Assistive Technology Act of 2004*
CAROI	Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative
CCRAA	*College Cost Reduction and Access Act*
CFAAA	*Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003*
CSP	*Charter Schools Program*
CRA	*Civil Rights Act of 1964*
CSPR	*Consolidated State Performance Report*
CSRS	Civil Service Retirement System
ECASLA	*Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008*
EDA	*Education of the Deaf Act of 1986*
EDEN	Education Data Exchange Network
EDPAS	Education Performance Appraisal System
EMAPS	ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System
ESEA	*Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*
ESRA	*Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002*
ESS	EDEN Submission System
FAFSA	Free Application for Federal Student Aid
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
FECA	*Federal Employees' Compensation Act*

FERS	Federal Employees Retirement System
FFB	Federal Financing Bank
FFEL	Federal Family Education Loan
FFMIA	*Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996*
FISMA	*Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002*
FMFIA	*Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982*
FOTW	FAFSA on the Web
FSA	Federal Student Aid
FY	Fiscal Year
GAPS	Grant Administration and Payment System
GA	Guaranty Agency
GPRA	*Government Performance and Results Act of 1993*
GSA	General Services Administration
HBCUs	Historically Black Colleges and Universities
HC	Human Capital
HCMS	Human Capital Management Staff
HEA	*Higher Education Act of 1965*
HRS	Human Resources Services
IB	International Baccalaureate
IDEA	*Individuals With Disabilities Education Act of 1975*
IES	Institute of Education Sciences
IP	Improper Payments
IPIA	*Improper Payments Information Act of 2002*
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
IT	Information Technology
LEA	Local Educational Agency
LLR	Lender of Last Resort
MD&A	Management's Discussion and Analysis

NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
NCLB	*No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*
NLA	*National Literacy Act of 1991*
NPSAS	National Postsecondary Student Aid Survey
OA	Organizational Assessment
OCR	Office for Civil Rights
OELA	Office of English Language Acquisition
OESE	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OII	Office of Innovation and Improvement
OM	Office of Management
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPE	Office of Postsecondary Education
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
OSDFS	Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools
OSERS	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
OVAE	Office of Vocational and Adult Education
PAR	*Performance and Accountability Report*
PBO	Performance-Based Organization
Perkins IV	*Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006*
PIC	Performance Improvement Council
PII	Personally Identifiable Information
PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
PLUS	Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students
RMS	Risk Management Service
RSA	Rehabilitation Services Administration
SAP	Special Allowance Payment

SEA	State Educational Agencies
SES	Senior Executive Services
SFSF	State Fiscal Stabilization Fund
SOF	Statement of Financing
SY	School Year
TASSIE	Title I Accountability Systems and School Improvement Efforts
TEACH	Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study
USC	United States Code
VPS	Visual Performance Suite
VR	Vocational Rehabilitation
WWC	What Works Clearinghouse

APPENDIX C: SELECTED DEPARTMENT WEB LINKS

The *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act*

- **Important *Recovery Act* Reference Sites**

  - Governmentwide Accountability and Transparency Updates
  - Department Weekly and Communication Reports
  - Department FY 2010 Detailed Budget and Budget Requests

  - *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009:* Frequently Asked Questions

Department Evaluation Studies

The Department designs evaluation studies to produce rigorous scientific evidence on the effectiveness of education programs and practices.

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/index.asp

http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html

State Education Data Profiles

This site includes demographic and achievement data by state and comparisons among states.

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/stateprofiles/

Performance Data

ED*Facts* is a Department initiative to put performance data at the center of policy, management and budget decisions for all K–12 educational programs.

http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html

Projections of Education Statistics to 2018

For the 50 states and the District of Columbia, the tables, figures and text contain data on projections of public elementary and secondary enrollment and public high school graduates to the year 2018. The report includes a methodology section describing models and assumptions used to develop national and state-level projections.

http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2009062

Discretionary Grant Programs for FY 2009

This site lists Department grant competitions previously announced, as well as those planned for later announcement, for new awards organized according to the Department's principal program offices.

http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/find/edlite-forecast.html

Research and Statistics

The *Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002* established the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) within the Department to provide research, evaluation and statistics to the nation's education system.

http://ies.ed.gov/

National Assessment Governing Board

The Governing Board is an independent, bipartisan group whose members include governors, state legislators, local and state school officials, educators, business representatives and members of the general public. Congress created the 26-member Governing Board in 1988 to set policy for the National Assessment of Educational Progress—commonly known as the "The Nation's Report Card."

http://www.nagb.org/

National Assessment of Educational Progress

The National Assessment of Educational Progress assesses samples of students in grades 4, 8 and 12 in various academic subjects. Results of the assessments are reported for the nation and states in terms of achievement levels—basic, proficient and advanced.

http://nationsreportcard.gov/

Government Accountability Office

The GAO supports Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and helps improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the benefit of the American people.

http://www.gao.gov/docsearch/agency.php

Office of Inspector General

The OIG has four primary business functions: audit, investigation, cyber security and evaluation and inspection.

http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/index.html

For a list of recent reports, go to:

http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/reports.html